

Application No. 10/057,364
Reply Brief

Customer No. 01933

Attorney Docket No. 02036/LH

This paper is being submitted
via EFS-Web on April 5, 2008

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT
AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT
APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In the event that this Paper is late filed, and the necessary petition for extension of time is not filed concurrently herewith, please consider this as a Petition for the requisite extension of time, and to the extent not already paid, authorization to charge the extension fee to Account No. 06-1378. In addition, authorization is hereby given to charge any fees for which payment has not been submitted, or to credit any overpayments, to Account No. 06-1378.

Applicant(s): Tomoya YOSHIDA

Serial No. : 10/057,364

Confirm. No.: 2010

Filed : January 24, 2002

For : ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM,
ADMINISTRATION APPARATUS,
RELAY SERVER, ADMINISTRATION
APPARATUS AND ADMINISTRATION
METHOD

Art Unit : 2154

Examiner : Joshua Joo

Appeal No. :

REPLY BRIEF

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
Mail Stop Appeal Briefs - Patents

This is responsive to the Examiner's Answer mailed
February 6, 2008.

This Reply Brief is being timely filed within two months of
the Examiner's Answer, by the due date of April 6, 2008.

R E M A R K S

It is respectfully submitted that, even in view of the Examiner's comments in the Examiner's Answer, the references USP 6,240,456 ("Teng et al"), USP 5,887,216 ("Motoyama") and USP 6,362,870 ("Mui et al") cited with respect to the independent claims do not fairly disclose, teach or suggest indirect communication of trouble type information from an administrated apparatus to an administrating apparatus, and indirect communication of restoration work information from an administrating apparatus to an administrated apparatus, where the administrated apparatus is located in a first local network and connected to the Internet through a first firewall server, and the administrating apparatus is located in a second local network and connected to the Internet through a second firewall server, and where the indirect communication takes place through the Internet via a relaying server, in the manner recited in independent claims 14, 25 and 28. And it is respectfully submitted that any interpretation of Teng et al, Motoyama and Mui et al, consistent with the respective fair teachings thereof, by one of ordinary skill in the art having common sense, would not achieve or render obvious independent claims 14, 25 or 28.

In particular, it is noted that Motoyama is relied on as suggesting a structure to be applied to Teng et al in which:

(i) an administrated apparatus is located in a first local network and connected to the Internet through a first firewall server of the first local network; (ii) an administering apparatus is located in a second local network and connected to the Internet through a second firewall server of the second local network; and (iii) a relaying server is located outside the first and second local networks.

More specifically, the Examiner asserts that "elements 12A-12I [of Motoyama] forwarding/routing data can be considered as a relay server" (page 11 of the Examiner's Answer).

It is respectfully submitted, however, that elements 12A-12I of Motoyama are quite different from the relaying server of the present invention as recited in independent claims 14, 25 and 28. That is, according to independent claims 14, 25 and 28, a specific relaying server is provided, to which information is transmitted, and from which information is obtained. By contrast, Motoyama discloses that the Internet 10 includes a plurality of interconnected computers and routers 12A-12I. And it is respectfully pointed out that Motoyama does not suggest that any one of the computers and routers 12A-12I may be a "relaying server" as recited in the independent claims. Rather, Motoyama discloses communication via the Internet between networks connected to the Internet via firewalls. Indeed, even according

to the Examiner's interpretation of Motoyama set forth at the top of page 11 of the Examiner's answer, a plurality of the elements 12A-12I enable communication between a workstation in LAN 52 and a printer in LAN 16. Thus, Motoyama does not suggest that any one of the elements 12A-12I is a specific relaying server to which information is transmitted and from which information is obtained (i.e., by being specifically accessed) in the manner of the present invention as recited in independent claims 14, 25 and 28.

In addition, it is also noted that Teng et al discloses communication over the Internet (internet 68 in Fig. 4, for example). More specifically, Teng et al discloses communication between the network client 20 and the network server 49 via the Internet 68.

It is respectfully submitted that in applying the teachings of Motoyama (namely, the teachings of communication via the Internet 10 between apparatuses in networks 16 and 52 which are connected to the Internet via firewalls) to the teachings of Teng et al (namely, communication via the Internet 68 between a network client 20 and a network server 49 coupled to a printer 50), the computers and routers making up the Internet (10 in Motoyama or 68 in Teng et al) would not suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art having common sense applying a specific relaying server in the manner recited in independent claims 14, 25 and 28.

And it is respectfully submitted that none of the cited references suggest (without the benefit of hindsight provided by the present application) a relaying server by which indirect communication is performed in the manner recited in any of independent claims 14, 25 and 28.

That is, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references do not disclose, teach or suggest indirect communication via a relaying server as recited in claim 14 such that an administrated apparatus transmits trouble type information to a relaying server through the first firewall server and the Internet, accesses the relaying server and obtains restoration work information based on the trouble type information from the relaying server through the first firewall server and the Internet (wherein the restoration work information is provided to the relaying server by the administrating apparatus through the second firewall server and the Internet), and conducts an automatic restoration process in accordance with the restoration work information.

In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references do not disclose, teach or suggest the indirect communication via a relaying server as recited in claim 25 such that an administrated apparatus transmits trouble type information to a relaying server through the Internet (wherein the trouble

type information is retrieved from the relaying server by the administrating apparatus through the Internet), accesses the relaying server and retrieves restoration work information from the relaying server through the Internet (wherein the restoration work information has been transmitted from the administrating apparatus to the relaying server through the Internet based on the trouble type information), and conducts an automatic restoration process in accordance with the restoration work information.

Still further, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references do not disclose, teach or suggest indirect communication via the relaying server as recited in claim 25 such that the administrating apparatus accesses the relaying server and retrieves trouble type information from the relaying server through the Internet (wherein the trouble type information has been transmitted from the administrated apparatus to the relaying server through the Internet), and transmits restoration work information to the relaying server through the Internet (wherein the restoration work information corresponds to the trouble type information and is transmitted to the relaying server for retrieval by the administrated apparatus from the relaying server through the Internet).

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references do not teach or fairly suggest the structural features

of independent claims 14, 25 and 28, or of any of the claims depending therefrom.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this Board reverse the rejection of appealed claims 14-30.

Respectfully submitted,

/Douglas Holtz/

Douglas Holtz
Reg. No. 33,902

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman & Chick, P.C.
220 Fifth Avenue - 16th Floor
New York, New York 10001-7708
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900
DH:iv